

# Professional Development

Bob Dunn ([bdunn@doe.state.vt.us](mailto:bdunn@doe.state.vt.us))

Fri, 30 Aug 1996 14:37:24 -0500

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Bill Cosh: "Basic vs. Advanced Telecommunications Services"
  - Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "RE: Support"
- 

As I think about the issues surrounding universal access to telecommunications by libraries and schools, I find myself struggling to visualize what the role of professional development might be as an integral part of any plan. My conclusion is that high-quality training must be included. It doesn't matter how much high-tech equipment is in schools if people don't have the knowledge or vision necessary for making it an important tool for teaching and learning. We have seen it before -- schools buy high-tech equipment which ends up collecting dust in some corner or is underutilized until it becomes obsolete. Teachers' plates are full and unless we include high-quality training as well as time to experiment and practice, I fear that this initiative might not reach its full potential.

Who should provide the professional development? I agree that there will be some exciting opportunities to form partnerships with service providers and business. These organizations can provide tips on the use of the equipment and some contexts for using it as an effective learning tool. We also need to identify groups of information technology using educators who will be available to offer some vision for innovative use by students of all ages. This could be made up of trainers in several regions so that local issues will be considered.

---

- Next message: Bill Cosh: "Basic vs. Advanced Telecommunications Services"
- Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "RE: Support"

# Basic vs. Advanced Telecommunications Services

Bill Cosh ([bcosh@wasb.org](mailto:bcosh@wasb.org))

Fri, 30 Aug 1996 16:01:03 -0700

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Marty Tennant: "Potential Technical Standards Role for Education"
  - Previous message: Bob Dunn: "Professional Development"
- 

Carole Teach raised a great issue when she asked what constituted "basic" services. This is something that education advocates and library supporters need to watch very carefully as the administrative rules are developed.

In Wisconsin the definition of basic vs. advanced telecommunications services was too much of a political "hot potatoe" for our Legislature to define in the telecommunications deregulation bill. When the issue eventually went to the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, education groups advocated for including things like 2-way distance learning services in the definition of basic as well as high speed internet access.

What we ended up with after the telecommunications industry lobbied the Public Service Commission was far different. Under Wisconsin's administrative rules, basic service now includes such things as brining an end to multi-party telephone lines by the year 2001 (there is still a waiver process that will exist for the telco's that can't accomplish this by 2001).

Good luck!!

---

- Next message: Marty Tennant: "Potential Technical Standards Role for Education"
- Previous message: Bob Dunn: "Professional Development"

# Potential Technical Standards Role for Education

Marty Tennant ([marty@sccoast.net](mailto:marty@sccoast.net))  
Fri, 30 Aug 1996 20:52:21 -0700

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Steve Kohn: "Professional Development"
  - Previous message: Bill Cosh: "Basic vs. Advanced Telecommunications Services"
- 

I'd like to propose a technical standards setting role for education.

The standards setting process can be based on competition, first to market, sheer capital resources, or expert group analysis (possibly this group and others).

Defining interfaces, electronic and human, is core to the effort.

I am personally in favor of education defining proper electronic inputs and outputs necessary to create a working system for the implementation of future technologies.

The inclusion of bridge interfaces to integrate existing technologies, while allowing for new techniques, will help deal with future uncertainties.

I see the PC as the platform for integration. PC based Local area networks can now even offer PBX capabilities, in addition to traditional data functions. Building on voice over the Net standards now being offered by some vendors would leverage even more network efficiencies.

What is even more promising is the creation of a prototype for neighborhood and residential use. In both cases, you have the potential for a facilities based network interconnection opportunity to upstream providers. This translates into lower cost potential.

Jack Buchanan has often mentioned the need for network efficiencies by keeping the residential and educational delivery systems uniform. I hope I'm referencing his views correctly.

Education could very well drive the whole electronic and human integration process.

Perhaps we should consider our potential role in the standards effort?

Marty Tennant

---

- Next message: Steve Kohn: "Professional Development"
- Previous message: Bill Cosh: "Basic vs. Advanced Telecommunications Services"

# Professional Development

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)

30 Aug 1996 17:29:17 GMT

- Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
  - Next message: Steve Kohn: "US Services"
  - Previous message: Marty Tennant: "Potential Technical Standards Role for Education"
  - Next in thread: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Professional Development"
- 

Per the attached comments:

I think everyone would agree that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 will be a waste of time and money if teachers do not receive professional development on how to use the technology, but more important, how to integrate all the newly available resources into the curriculum.

Having agreed on that, it is then a question of funds - where will the additional \$\$ for professional development come from. As stated elsewhere in these discussions, the split of \$\$ is probably 1/3 for telecommunications (this is actually probably high), 1/3 for professional development, and 1/3 for content. Some estimates for the telecommunication services covered by US is between \$20B and \$~\$47B depending what is included - just for telecommunication services. Now double that if you want to include professional development. Now develop a surcharge to cover this and you are probably looking at a ~20% -25% surcharge on people's phone bills once you include residential universal service also - will the FCC support such a tax??

Putting that aside, nothing in the legislation talks about US covering professional development.

Steve Kohn  
notes.skohn@nynex.com

- > As I think about the issues surrounding universal access to
- > telecommunications by libraries and schools, I find myself struggling to
- > visualize what the role of professional development might be as an integral
- > part of any plan. My conclusion is that high-quality training must be
- > included. It doesn't matter how much high-tech equipment is in schools if
- > people don't have the knowledge or vision necessary for making it an
- > important tool for teaching and learning. We have seen it before -- schools
- > buy high-tech equipment which ends up collecting dust in some corner or is
- > underutilized until it becomes obsolete. Teachers' plates are full and
- > unless we include high-quality training as well as time to experiment and
- > practice, I fear that this initiative might not reach its full potential.
- >
- > Who should provide the professional development? I agree that there will be
- > some exciting opportunities to form partnerships with service providers and
- > business. These organizations can provide tips on the use of the equipment
- > and some contexts for using it as an effective learning tool. We also need
- > to identify groups of information technology using educators who will be
- > available to offer some vision for innovative use by students of all ages.
- > This could be made up of trainers in several regions so that local issues
- > will be considered.

- 
- **Next message:** Steve Kohn: "US Services"
  - **Previous message:** Marty Tennant: "Potential Technical Standards Role for Education"
  - **Next in thread:** Ronda Hauben: "Re: Professional Development"

# US Services

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)

30 Aug 1996 17:29:17 GMT

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
- Next message: Steve Kohn: "Reply"
- Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Professional Development"

---

> Is it possible to define telecommunications services to schools and  
> libraries as provision of a pipeline (of sufficient capacity) connecting  
> every classroom and library to information infrastructures?

Yes, there are various telecommunication services available that could be used depending on the particular situation at a particular school/school district.

> Is it possible  
> to define sufficient capacity in such a way as to allow for "advances in  
> telecommunications and information technologies and services" as the law  
> requires?

No, I believe capacity needs are changing to rapidly to be able to put in the final solution today.

> Is it possible to define this pipeline in such a way that all  
> carriers--telephone companies or cable companies or whatever company--could  
> provide the service in order to take advantage of what exists already in a  
> community, building on that to bring the most cost-effective services to  
> schools and libraries?

Yes, I think we can get pretty close to this. Telcos have POTS, ISDN, Frame Relay, ADSL, FDDI, and ATM. Cable companies have cable modems. Most of these technologies can support a certain level of voice, video and data.

> I'd love to "hear" some answers to my questions.  
> Mary Harley Kruter

- 
- Next message: Steve Kohn: "Reply"
  - Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Professional Development"

# Reply

Steve Kohn (NOTES.SKOHN@A50VM1.trg.nynex.COM)  
30 Aug 1996 17:29:17 GMT

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
- Next message: Ken Hammer: "Definition of services"
- Previous message: Steve Kohn: "US Services"
- Next in thread: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply"

---

> I've tried to raise some of the questions your questions raise,  
> and welcome others thoughts on all this.  
>  
> Ronda Hauben  
> rh120@columbia.edu

I think we are going to short change education if we think Universal Service for Libraries and Education is just access to the Internet. I imagine schools using voice messaging to keep parents involved in the child's education - not everyone has access to the Internet! I envision rural schools using distance learning to access "live" content they can't provide locally. I'm working on other projects that are very good for education, but outside the realm of the Internet.

Steve Kohn  
notes.skohn@nynex.com

- 
- Next message: Ken Hammer: "Definition of services"
  - Previous message: Steve Kohn: "US Services"
  - Next in thread: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply"

# Definition of services

Ken Hammer ([ken.hammer@ConnRiver.net](mailto:ken.hammer@ConnRiver.net))

Fri, 30 Aug 96 21:50:57 -0500

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
- Next message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: Educational Value"
- Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Reply"

---

Mary Harley Kruter said:

"Before one can grapple with the economic issues of pricing and discounting a service, it is necessary to define the service. Is there a clear definition or understanding of exactly what "telecommunications services" means in the context of our discussion? If not, that's where I suggest we begin."

I like that. I'm worried that the whole regulating process is getting way out in front of an evolving capability and may well stifle it so that it is more expensive than it need be. Some earlier study I did suggested that the storage, transmission and switching about which we voice such concern in this seminar could ultimately be free at the margin.

We have heard some concern for the training, maintenance and upgrade costs. I think those will exceed the data transmission costs by far and trivialize the issue "discounting" by the isp's and carriers.

Yet to evolve is the price for content. So far it's largely free. We seem to expect that to continue. I don't. Is that value and expectation included in our discussion? It probably is not as a matter of FCC jurisdiction, but it certainly is important in considering the affordability of internet access to information by the educational institutions.

--

---

K.F.Hammer Associates  
management consultations

Ken Hammer  
St. Johnsbury, VT 05819

---

\*MR/2 ICE Tag: Diplomacy: letting someone else have your way.

---

- Next message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: Educational Value"
- Previous message: Steve Kohn: "Reply"



# Re: Educational Value

Tom Hibbs ([thibbs@k12.colostate.edu](mailto:thibbs@k12.colostate.edu))  
Fri, 30 Aug 1996 20:20:54 -0600 (MDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: First reactions"
  - Previous message: Ken Hammer: "Definition of services"
  - Maybe in reply to: Mario Zinga: "Educational Value"
- 

At 12:45 PM 8/29/96 -0700, Currie Morrison wrote:  
>On Thu, 29 Aug 1996, Mario Zinga wrote:

>My feelilng is that Mario has made a siginificant contribution in getting  
>this discussion moving forward.

>

>My feeling is that standards have been and are being set from a purely  
>technological and hardware standpoint already. For that area we should  
>push for lowcost devices and access that schools can afford.

When schools pay through taxes, they are using money collected from all the public to obtain services to educate our children, and as mentioned several times, and our adult population. I don't mind a monopoly being obliged to provide special services for specific segments of their customers, but Internet service is not covered by monopoly legislation (like phone service). I think schools need to pay the cost. That way the cost is spread out to all the people in the district, not to the customers of the service company.

>

>However, much more important is how we want to use the access to enhance  
>our children's education and how we are going to train the milions of  
>present day teachers to not use this access but to use this access in an  
>enthusiastic way.

>

>Waiting for the next generatin of college trained teachers is too long to  
>wait.

Please don't wait on the regular college trained teachers. I agree that the money from this legislation needs to be manipulated, but I would favor that we use it to connect schools and libraries for a "trial period" so they can learn to use the technology during the beginning periods when it is not a "reasonable cost" based on educational benefit. This would be like funding original research. Once we get to the stage that a district has had connectivity for a period of time, they are not likely to drop out. They are likely to closely monitor their source and look for the best price.

We have had a four year experience as the only school in a 70-mile circle that has had a 56K connection. The grant paid the going public price for the services in our area. The initial years of a grant covering the connection and training were essential in exploring our needs. This year we were required to pay for our own connection. The board didn't even question the expense. The training part was and is essential! It is still funded by the grant.

For reference, we are one of the nation's and Colorado's very small schools

with only 250 students K-12. That qualifies us as rural. We teach Internet, have a WWW site, teach programming, and have our own server because of an "initial connection and continuing training" grant. Other school districts participating in the grant are about 1500 to many thousands of students in Denver. The impact in a rural area is more dramatic, but even for the larger districts, the impact of the "initial connection and continuing training" grant is very important.

>

This legislation needs to be manipulated and a way that a significant sum of money be spent on training and acceptable uses of this technology.

>THIS IS AN AREA WHERE BUSINESS SEEMS TO DO A MUCH BETTER JOB THAN

>SCHOOL DISTRICTS. Why???

>

>Cheers!

>

>Currie

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

- 
- Next message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: First reactions"
  - Previous message: Ken Hammer: "Definition of services"
  - Maybe in reply to: Mario Zinga: "Educational Value"

# Re: First reactions

Tom Hibbs ([thibbs@k12.colostate.edu](mailto:thibbs@k12.colostate.edu))  
Fri, 30 Aug 1996 20:29:47 -0600 (MDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Gene Chesser: "How universal is an internet phone?"
  - Previous message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: Educational Value"
  - Maybe in reply to: Ken Hammer: "First reactions"
  - Next in thread: Marty Tennant: "Re: First reactions"
- 

At 03:40 PM 8/29/96 -0500, Ken Hammer wrote:

>I'm new to this so the reactions are derived more from experience than the specifics of this discussion. Background: manufacturer jet engines and computers; president scale company; hospital trustee; independent school trustee.

>

>1. We seem to be trying to impose rational social/political structure on top of an evolving growing weed-like phenomenon.>The "further comments" section is incomprehensible geek talk to a newcomer.

>

>2. "Universal" is a politically popular pandering term for which we can never state the costs. They always grow far beyond our beginning imaginations.

>

>3. "Subsidies" are not.

>

Thanks for the wake-up call. We tax ourselves with direct taxes to fund education. We should not ask our society to tax us with indirect taxes so we can "afford what we are not willing to pay for." We should keep the monopolies from charging us outrageous fees for services for the benefit of a few major stockholders in the name of the millions that have a few shares, but own nothing!

That, however, is a social issue, but so is this entire legislation.

Tom Hibbs

1995 Presidential Award for Excellence in Teaching of Mathematics, Colorado  
Cheraw High School Math Teacher

---

- Next message: Gene Chesser: "How universal is an internet phone?"
- Previous message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: Educational Value"
- Maybe in reply to: Ken Hammer: "First reactions"
- Next in thread: Marty Tennant: "Re: First reactions"

# How universal is an internet phone?

Gene Chesser ([chesser@tiug.org](mailto:chesser@tiug.org))

Sat, 31 Aug 1996 03:20:32 -0500

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
- ☐ Next message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Professional Development"
- ☐ Previous message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: First reactions"

Hi All,

The discussion of universal service is certainly being aired out!

While reading my 39 email messages today an interesting article popped up that I felt was relevant...

So much of the rhetoric is in comparison to the traditional "definition" of universal service that we all have come to recognize as "picking up the phone -- dialing a number -- and someone answers". The service should be available to anyone "universally".

Next we get bogged down in what is "technology" and how does all this internet and computer based rhetoric related to our traditional "definition".

I continue to "lurk" on the us-nd listserver and jump to the next message...

Another of my listservers (Money Daily) supplies my next input...

What's today's subject? "Web-phone breakthrough: Look Ma, no computer!"

As I read along I'm stopped by a quote in the article from a FCC lawyer... "Neither service will affect the Federal Communications Commission's hands-off attitude toward web-phones, according to Kevin Werbach, an FCC attorney."

Now I ask you? ... How universal is an internet phone? ...

I suggest the FCC adopt a hands-on attitude toward digital technologies and make universal service at least an internet phone.

I'll quote a portion of today's Money Daily listserver message for details:

```

"=====
>Subject: MONEY Daily: Web-phone breakthrough: Look Ma, no computer!
>X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.0 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN
>
>Weekend, August 31-September 2, 1996
>
>Web-phone breakthrough: Look Ma, no computer!
>
>Two new Internet long-distance services let you
>place a call ... with your telephone
>
>by Tripp Reynolds
>
>Two companies about to enter the Web-phone market
>have succeeded in disconnecting telephony
>technology from your computer. LATIC and AlphaNet

```

>Telecom, Inc. (Toronto exchange: FAX) are  
>developing services they hope to roll out before  
>the end of the year that let users place phone-to-  
>phone Internet calls. Current Web-phone services  
>require a computer-to-computer or computer-to-phone  
>connection.  
>  
>"The possibilities of eliminating the computer and  
>the pipe and going phone-to-phone are enormous,"  
>says Ted Julian, an Internet analyst for IDC  
>Communications. "The big difference between these  
>guys going phone-to-phone instead of computer-to-  
>computer is the market potential -- a lot more  
>people have phones than computers."  
>  
>The new services, LATIC's Latcall and AlphaNet's  
>UniPost, are both uncharacteristically easy to use,  
>although at this point, UniPost is the slicker and  
>more refined of the two. Since no computer  
>knowledge is required, either Latcall or UniPost  
>can be used by just about anyone.  
>  
>Here's how it works. You pick up the telephone,  
>dial into a gateway-server, enter an account number  
>or a credit card number, and then dial the phone  
>number. The process is similar to making a credit  
>card phone call; UniPost even guides you through  
>these steps with an electronic voice prompt.  
>  
>On the back-end the two services operate  
>differently. The LATIC gateway-server, one end  
>plugged into the phone network and the other  
>plugged into the Internet, routes the call over the  
>Web to another of the company's servers, which then  
>taps back into the phone network and rings the  
>appropriate phone.  
>  
>"That's an interesting way of approaching Internet  
>telephony," says Peter Andrew, a research analyst  
>for A.G. Edwards. "LATIC certainly could be on to  
>something. It could be especially attractive to  
>corporations that can afford to put servers in  
>different branch offices."  
>  
>IDC's Julian agrees, adding: "Business have shown  
>an interest in this technology, and they are  
>probably the low-hanging fruit here. They have  
>already built intranets for e-mail, document  
>sharing and what-not. If you can add a little  
>bandwidth and some servers and get voice, that's  
>pretty cool. You wouldn't pay AT&T at all unless  
>that's who you buy your Internet bandwidth from."  
>  
>Andrew points out that one of the advantages LATIC  
>has over original Web phones is its separation from  
>on-line service providers. "If you were using AOL  
>during its recent blackout, you wouldn't have been  
>able to use your phone for 16 hours." The downside,  
>he says, is that LATIC would have to put one of its  
>gateway servers in just about every local calling  
>exchange in the country.  
>  
>AlphaNet hopes to avoid this problem by leasing  
>large chunks of the Internet's infrastructure from  
>Sprint, according to Charles Mathews, vice-chairman

>of AlphaNet. Mathews cites two advantages to this  
>approach. First, AlphaNet is able to cordon off its  
>area of the Internet from other traffic, which  
>increases the service's sound quality (when the  
>Internet is congested with heavy usage, voice calls  
>typically suffer because they have to be  
>transmitted without interruption in order to sound  
>intelligible). Second, AlphaNet doesn't need to  
>place servers in every nook and cranny around the  
>world. Where ever the Internet goes, so goes  
>UniPost, providing, of course, that AlphaNet comes  
>up with the necessary funds to rent the lines from  
>Sprint.

>

>For ease of use, the new services outperform most  
>of the current Web-phones, simply by providing  
>phone-to-phone service. Besides being frustrating  
>to set up, software versions of Web-phones can be  
>inconvenient to use. Configuration and  
>compatibility issues often necessitate the use of a  
>real phone or lots of e-mail to set up a time and  
>place to make a Web-phone call, which seems to  
>defeat the purpose.

>

>We tested Latcall and UniPost using the telephones  
>here at Money Online. The sound quality was  
>surprisingly clear and free of the electronic  
>squawks, hisses and disconnects normally associated  
>with Internet telephony. Two relatively minor  
>drawbacks: a slight lag between the time one person  
>speaks and the other one hears it, and a signal  
>that's somewhat weaker than a regular telephone  
>call (a problem we were able to solve by turning up  
>the volume on our phones).

>

>Overall, though, LATIC and AlphaNet offer the first  
>Web-phone services that begin to rival the quality  
>of the traditional long-distance carriers. But you  
>get what you pay for. Unlike other Web-phones,  
>Latcall and UniPost won't be free. Currently, the  
>pricing structure for Latcalls are set at \$0.05-  
>\$0.08 a minute for a domestic U.S. call. AlphaNet  
>has not finalized a pricing structure for UniPost,  
>but they will charge what the market will bear,  
>according to Mathews.

>

>Neither service will affect the Federal  
>Communications Commission's hands-off attitude  
>toward Web-phones, according to Kevin Werbach, an  
>FCC attorney. But he adds: "The technology is  
>evolving in a lot of ways. It's not only becoming  
>more convenient, but the quality is also becoming  
>better. That will affect the penetration rate. As  
>the penetration goes up and the usage goes up, it  
>may eventually change the way the FCC views  
>telephony."

>

>So how can you make one of these calls? Neither one  
>is ready for broad use at this point, but of the  
>two services, LATIC's is more geared toward home  
>users. AlphaNet, according to Mathews, is going  
>after corporate and business clients first,  
>although he hasn't ruled out making the service  
>available to individuals. You can visit AlphaNet's  
>Web site at <http://www.alphanet.net> to get more

>information on how to use UniPost.

>

>The first step to making a Latcall is to wait until  
>late September when it is scheduled to become  
>commercially available. LATIC only has two servers  
>working right now, one in Washington and one in San  
>Francisco. But the company expects to have 10  
>servers in operation and a Web site (now under  
>construction at [www.latic.com](http://www.latic.com)) where you can sign  
>up for the service by the time it launches.  
>

=====

In conclusion, I ask again; how universal is an internet phone?

Comments?

Gene Chesser  
Independent Consultant  
President Texas ISDN Users Group

~~~~~

J. E. "Gene" Chesser  
[chesser@tiug.org](mailto:chesser@tiug.org)  
<http://www.ph.utexas.edu/~chesser>  
Voice (915) 646-2116

~~~~~

- 
- ☐ Next message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Professional Development"
  - ☐ Previous message: Tom Hibbs: "Re: First reactions"

# Re: Professional Development

Ronda Hauben ([rh120@columbia.edu](mailto:rh120@columbia.edu))

Sat, 31 Aug 1996 07:55:29 -0400 (EDT)

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
- ☐ Next message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply"
- ☐ Previous message: Gene Chesser: "How universal is an internet phone?"
- ☐ Maybe in reply to: Steve Kohn: "Professional Development"

Responding to comments from Steve Kohn ([notes.skohn@nynex.com](mailto:notes.skohn@nynex.com))

>Per the attached comments:

>I think everyone would agree that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 will be a  
>waste of time and money if teachers do not receive professional development on  
>how to use the technology, but more important, how to integrate all the newly  
>available resources into the curriculum.

>Having agreed on that, it is then a question of funds - where will the  
>additional \$\$ for professional development come from. As stated elsewhere in  
>these discussions, the split of \$\$ is probably 1/3 for telecommunications (this  
>is actually probably high), 1/3 for professional development, and 1/3 for  
>content. Some estimates for the telecommunication services covered by US is

Why are funds needed for content? The Internet makes it possible for people to contribute their own content. Thus what is needed is access so people can contribute content, not payment for content.

The communications aspects of the Internet are what the FCC is being charged with making available.

Also, the Freenet or community computer networking prototype makes training available as part of its structure and at a vrey low cost as it utilizes volunteers to do so. The money to set it up and run it is spent on the essentials which are the telephone lines, some minimal staff to run it, etc.

That's why it seems there is a need to examine how to spread the actual working prototypes, rather than speculate about providing all sorts of things that don't yet exist.

>between \$20B and \$~\$47B depending what is included - just for telecommunication  
>services. Now double that if you want to include professional development.  
>Now develop a surcharge to cover this and you are probably looking at a ~20%  
>-25% surcharge on people's phone bills once you include residential universal  
>service also - will the FCC support such a tax??

That is why the current Telecommunications Act is a problem, not a solution to the issue of how to provide universal service in computer networking - it puts providing out rates to businesses and subsidies to corporate entities above providing universal service.

The debate of who will benefit if there is universal service to the Internet (meaning residential as well as public sites) hasn't yet happened. Instead the law assumes that supporting cutbacks in



costs to corporate customers (by supporting supposed competition which will only benefit big corporate users) is the crucial issue, and the issue of providing universal service (which will benefit all) has been narrowed down to providing discounts to schools and libraries with the residential users getting a surcharge to pay for these. This isn't a way to provide universal service, but to take phones away from residential users who can't afford to subsidize low rates to big corporate users.

And the libraries and schools are being asked to help in this take away of universal service to residential users.

This isn't a process that the FCC should be involved with either since it's founding basis has to do with the provision of universal service.

So it seems there is a need to talk about how to provide for universal service to all residential users, rather than just to schools and libraries as part of this online discussion.

Examining how Freenets grow out of university computer facilities like Cleveland Freenet or work as part of university facilities and have extended access to the entire community to a basic Internet minimum (Usenet newsgroups and email and a text based browser) is something real that can be examined and there can be real discussion of how to make it available. That is the kind of discussion that would provide for recommendations and rules that will provide something real for people, and the cost is very minimal.

In NYC we have tried to make such access available and hit lots of roadblocks as doing something like that in a large city with a large population poses significant problems. That is why there is a need for government regulations to help.

I just returned from a visit to Amsterdam in Holland. There there is a national policy to try to support telecommunications. And in Amsterdam the city council helped to start the DDS - the digital stadt (i.e. the digital city) to make a minimal level of free access to newsgroups, email, local discussion groups, and www available to all for free.

Don't we need to look at situations like this around the world to see how the U.S. is currently falling farther and farther behind as it speculates about offering "advanced telecommunications services" and therefore the minimal access to the Internet is denied to people in cities like NYC.

>Putting that aside, nothing in the legislation talks about US covering  
>professional development.

Don't we have to sort out what is important. I recognize that certain minimal sectors of the U.S. were asked what they wanted by Congress when they drafted the Telecommunications Act of 1996, but they left out the majority of us and therefore to now go along and only discuss what the telecos asked for is not going to provide what we who should have been involved in the process much earlier need and have been fighting for.

>Steve Kohn  
>notes.skohn@nynex.com

Ronda  
rh120@columbia.edu

- 
- ☐ Next message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply"
  - ☐ Previous message: Gene Chesser: "How universal is an internet phone?"
  - ☐ Maybe in reply to: Steve Kohn: "Professional Development"

# Re: Reply

Ronda Hauben ([rh120@columbia.edu](mailto:rh120@columbia.edu))  
 Sat, 31 Aug 1996 07:33:15 -0400 (EDT)

- ☐ Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
- ☐ Next message: Ferdi Serim: "my first four bars"
- ☐ Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Professional Development"
- ☐ Maybe in reply to: Steve Kohn: "Reply"

[Moderator's Note: I want to remind all posters of the etiquette that has been requested of seminar participants. (See the section labeled "Preliminaries" on the Universal Service/Network Democracy home page:

<http://info-ren.pitt.edu/universal-service/> ).

All seminar participants are here as individuals, not as official representatives of their organizations. Hence, while Steve may be able to respond to some of Ronda's questions about NYNEX, he needn't feel obligated to do so. Next week I want to try to steer the discussion back toward specifics of the Telecommunications Act and its implementation. In this context it is important to examine the material which has been submitted to the FCC and placed on-line for the use of seminar participants. It would be very useful for us all to learn what the various companies and organizations are saying in their testimony - and whether the actions of these groups actually match the positions they are taking. If, for example, there is hyperbole with regard to the ability of some groups to provide broad services at low cost without the force of federal regulation, then it's important to point this out. This is what is behind the assignment given to all seminar participants to prepare summaries of some of the Comments and Reply Comments submitted to the FCC. You will find the text of this material in the On-line Repository for this seminar, a pointer to which can be found on the home page cited above. I don't want to damp down individual opinion and individual experience in this discussion, but if we are going to have an impact, it has to be in the context of the current proceedings.]

Responding to Steve Kohn ([notes.skohn@nynex.com](mailto:notes.skohn@nynex.com))

> I've tried to raise some of the questions your questions raise,  
 > and welcome others thoughts on all this.  
 >  
 > Ronda Hauben  
 > [rh120@columbia.edu](mailto:rh120@columbia.edu)

>I think we are going to short change education if we think Universal Service  
 >for Libraries and Education is just access to the Internet. I imagine  
 >schools using voice messaging to keep parents involved in the child's  
 >education - not everyone has access to the Internet! I envision rural  
 >schools using distance learning to access "live" content they can't  
 >provide locally. I'm working on other projects that are  
 >very good for education, but outside the realm of the Internet.

But who is working on making Internet access, particularly access to the worldwide communication that the Internet makes possible available to everyone in the U.S.? That's why the concept of POTS (Plain Old Telephone Service) was so important as it provided

a minimum that would be available to everyone.

It seems once you start saying there is no need for a minimum service, you can argue for all sorts of things, but the minimum gets lost and therefore not available.

I've wondered why NYNEX hasn't helped there to be a free-net or community network in NYC. NYC is a major city and yet it is backward in what it offers its citizens. Several of us presented talks at the NYPL (New York Public Library) about the important communications that the Internet made possible. Many people came to the talks. Several of those who came felt it was crucial for NYC to have some form of community network that would provide basic access to Usenet newsgroups and email and a text based browser like the Freenets and community networks provide in many other cities around the U.S. and in a number of cities in Canada. The talks were announced in lots of the local newspapers that announce events. Also, the talks were announced on Usenet. I would have expected someone from NYNEX to have been interested. However, no one got in contact with us or seemed interested.

That's why it seems that there needs to be some government provision identifying what is a minimum standard and providing the regulation to provide for it. Otherwise it would seem that the teleco's would determine what they think is needed, and citizens will be considered "customers" rather than citizens.

Steve, is there some reason that NYNEX isn't in support of having a Freenet or local community network like the Cleveland Free-Net in New York City? Is there some reason that they haven't been encouraging to have such a minimal set of access to Usenet newsgroups, email and a text based browser made available to everyone at a low or free cost so that people will have some minimal level of Internet connection available as people in the U.S. in other cities like Cleveland, and Youngstown, and Washington D.C. and Los Angeles, etc. have available?

>Steve Kohn  
>notes.skohn@nynex.com

Ronda  
rh120@columbia.edu

- 
- ☐ **Next message:** Ferdi Serim: "my first four bars"
  - ☐ **Previous message:** Ronda Hauben: "Re: Professional Development"
  - ☐ **Maybe in reply to:** Steve Kohn: "Reply"

# my first four bars

Ferdi Serim ([ferdi@tiger.junc.net](mailto:ferdi@tiger.junc.net))

Sat, 31 Aug 1996 10:50:18 -0400

- Messages sorted by: [ date ] [ thread ] [ subject ] [ author ]
  - Next message: Bob Carlitz: "excerpts of the Telecom Act for easy viewing"
  - Previous message: Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply"
- 

HI all,

This is some group to keep up with (Coltrane's debut of "Giant Steps" comes to mind)! Before I respond to issues of professional development and educational use, some intro...I teach in the Princeton Regional Schools. I have 600 students who are kids, and 300 students who are teachers. My goal is to help all of them harness technology for lifelong learning. We have a high level of connectivity in every classroom district-wide, as well as in homework centers in the "affordable housing" sections of town, that I'd wager we'd be proud of as a result, should our efforts on this list produce this kind of access for every classroom.

Now, entering a third year of work in seeing both "what this sucker will do, flat out" (meaning what are the possibilities and effects on learning) as well as "what does it take to keep this flying" (meaning what interventions are scalable and sustainable to make ever larger numbers of people confident and capable), I hope to provide some "first hand" reports to this discussion, as appropriate. This work has grown out of my prior experiences as: a Jazz Artist in Residence for the National Endowment of the Arts; an early champion of classroom Internet use; a systems analyst for a couple engineering companies, and most recently as co-author of "NetLearning: Why Teachers Use the Internet".

In response to the great need educators face in learning to apply the potentials of the Internet to their work, I helped found the Online Internet Institute (OII). The OII represents a distributed educational model for ongoing collaborative professional growth created by classroom educators (see <http://oii.org>).

Thanks to Bob Carlitz' reminder about homework, I'm off to do mine! But before doing so, a guiding principle might be: givers can be subsidized by takers.

Those who contribute to the efforts needed to prepare users, verify/organize content of educator generated materials, or in other measurable ways give value to the scale up effort ought to get access from wherever they are in return. Access can be used for anything (I've had teachers in my workshops enthusiastically master html, only to produce web pages for their "side" businesses!) but when it is purposefully used to advance the opportunities for learning, it is appropriate for such access to be subsidized.

Now, some responses to topics discussed thus far:

1 Who should provide professional development?

On the basis of my experiences in Princeton, and working with hundreds of educators around the country, I can tell you that the challenges require

## 2 Access

### 3. Communication vs Education

#### 4. Tracking the Keepers and the Chaff

Off to do my homework!

Ferdi

"We are more than the sum of our knowledge,  
we are the products of our imagination." - Ferdi

- **Next message:** Bob Carlitz: "excerpts of the Telecom Act for easy viewing"
- **Previous message:** Ronda Hauben: "Re: Reply"

# excerpts of the Telecom Act for easy viewing

Bob Carlitz ([bob@info-ren.pitt.edu](mailto:bob@info-ren.pitt.edu))

Sat, 31 Aug 1996 13:09:08 -0400 (EDT)

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Dennis Golombek: "Thoughts from the First 10 Years.."
  - Previous message: Ferdi Serim: "my first four bars"
- 

The "Useful Documents" section of the Universal Service/Network Democracy Web site contains a pointer to the full text of the Telecom Act. The full text version isn't broken up into separate files for the various sections. You might want to take the time to download the whole thing and save it for viewing on your local machine. Or you might prefer to concentrate upon the pieces of most immediate relevance for the on-line seminar. To assist you in that task, I've prepared a set of excerpts. You can reach them directly at

<http://info-ren.pitt.edu/universal-service/excerpts.html>

or from the "Useful Documents" page.

If you have not already done so, please take the time to read through Section 254 of the Act. This section provides the basis of the discussion of Universal Service. We should try to refer to it and related FCC material such as the Notice of Proposed Rule Making and the Request for Further Comments as we continue the seminar. I'll put together excerpts from the other documents as we proceed.

Bob Carlitz  
Moderator

---

- Next message: Dennis Golombek: "Thoughts from the First 10 Years.."
- Previous message: Ferdi Serim: "my first four bars"

# Thoughts from the First 10 Years..

Dennis Golombek ([golombek@localnet.com](mailto:golombek@localnet.com))

Sat, 31 Aug 1996 13:22:05 -0500

- Messages sorted by: [ date || thread || subject || author ]
  - Next message: Darlene H. Hartman-Hallam: "Schools reselling????"
  - Previous message: Bob Carlitz: "excerpts of the Telecom Act for easy viewing"
- 

Hi to all!

These musings are my own and do not reflect those of my school district or that of the Buffalo Free-Net.

\*\*\*\*\*

After being involved with educational telecommunications for 10 years (starting with a list server that our moderator set up) I've seen interest in this area grow from it being viewed as a pleasant after school activity for a few "geeky" gifted students to one that has become seen as necessary for all students "if affordable." The genie came out of the bottle.

Over the past decade we've gone from dealing with the former New York Telephone Co. in search of grants for added lines so as not to interfere with office functions. In those days there seemed to be no education plans from the phone company and we waited a few years until they got religion and started sponsoring some grants around the state to help tele-education. An elementary school in my district actually received one of these grants for a 5th grade project. That classroom is one of the few in the district that has a phone in it.

I'm now glad to see that NYNEX (nee New York Telephone) is helping to sponsor this seminar and seems to be much more active in education. Teachers I talk with are leary as to what may happen when once again the company is absorbed by Bell Atlantic and tries to learn its new market area. ( Steve Kohn may have an idea about this?)

Everything has gotten better except the costs. Hardware, software, greater speed. Anyone here remember FTPing with a 300 baud modem? Teachers are finding Netscape and other browsers much friendlier than some UNIX account they had in college. ISDN is now being promoted where as a few years ago I was told by a phone company rep I'd never have a need for it.

A suggestion I'd like to make is that the phone companies actually increase their association with the K-12 educational communities. I know they have sales reps assigned to their major education customers like colleges and universities. These reps know the telephony side of their business. The companies should also employ reps who can understand the needs of teachers in the trenches at the K-12 level.

Several years ago a few of us began the Buffalo Free-Net (BFN), the first freenet in New York State. The process of getting the system up and going was greatly helped by staff from the State University of New York



at Buffalo which agreed to house our boxes and allow staff to help with the more technical problems. This "town and gown" relationship helped foster a great relationship with the Buffalo & Erie County Public Libraries and the Western New York Library Resource Council. Many others have volunteered greatly to run their SIGs.

"Technology Tuesdays" are offered at the main library in downtown Buffalo where the community can attend and learn how to use the BFN. Many Tuesdays there is standing room only at these classes. The BFN now has several thousand members and keeps growing. I assume these members help provide a good profit for their phone companies. To paraphrase Field of Dreams: If you build a network it will be used.

When our K-12 students graduate some may have access through their post-secondary institutions. Those who don't attend college are able to remain online through a freenet or community-net at a rate cheaper than some ISP. As a matter of fact I still get e-mail from former students from around the country who use these networks. It's a thrill to hear from them and one of the things that makes teaching wonderful.

Sorry for the ramblings. Later!

Dennis

- 
- **Next message:** Darlene H. Hartman-Hallam: "Schools reselling????"
  - **Previous message:** Bob Carlitz: "excerpts of the Telecom Act for easy viewing"